UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/409,300 | 09/29/1999 | THOMAS CONNELLY | P/2167-101 | 5170 |

7590 06/19/2003

STEVEN I. WEISBURD, ESQ.
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP
1177 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS - 41st FLOOR
NEW YORK, NY 10036-2714

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| TRUONG, LECHI | |
| **ART UNIT** | **PAPER NUMBER** |
| 2126 | 5 |

DATE MAILED: 06/19/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 09/409,300 | CONNELLY, THOMAS | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | LeChi Truong | 2126 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 September 1999* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-76* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-76* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *2* .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. Claims **1,2, 4, 17, 19, 20, 23, 28-34, 36-42, 44, 45, 46, 59, 60, 63, 68-76** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall et al (US. Patent 5,826,023) in view of Gerety et al ( US. Paternt 5,212, 792).

**As to claim 1**, Hall teaches a message (MINE message 302, col 5, ln 59-67 to col 6, ln 1-30), a first application, second application (client 300, col 5, ln 59-67), a transport infrastructure (first protocol/ SNADS routers, col 3, ln 2-32/ SNADS network, cl 6, ln 1-30), a first service (a first format/ address according to format I, col 3, ln 40-67), the first set of parameter (a tunnel-to attribure/ recipient e-mail address, col 5, ln 59-67 to col 6, ln 1-30), a first directory (directory 304, col 5, ln 59-67 to col 6, ln 1-30), second application( local or remote, col 3, ln 40-67/ a first destination client, col 8, ln 35-60).

Hall does not teach the term a first service identifier. However, Gerety teaches the request-ID field 112 (col 7, ln 18-40)

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Gerety to Hall in order to select the recipient software tools for transferring the message.

**As to claim 2**, Hall teaches the second application (local or remote, col 3, ln 40-67/ a first destination client, col 8, ln 35-60/ system, col 7, ln 1-29), the message (message 316, col 7, ln 1-29), a second set of parameters (the SNADS message 316 recipient is local, col 7, ln 13-29), a second directory (SNADS directory 328, col 7, ln 1-19), the transport infrastructure (SNADS network 308), the second service identifier (the address resolution program 326 to determine if the SNADS message 316 recipient is local from accessing SNADS directory( col 7, ln 1-29).

**As to claim 4**, Hall does not teach the message is conveyed asynchronously. However, Gerety teach asynchronously (asynchronous transmission, col 10, ln 35-47).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Gerety to Hall in order to make the application independent messaging system more consistent.

**As to claim 17,** Hall teaches routing information with respect to the second application (a SNADS recipient e-mail address, col 5, ln 59-67).

**As to claim 19**, Hall teaches the first directory (directory 302, col 5, ln 53-67), a plurality of set of parameters (a SNADS recipient e-mail address, col 5, ln 53-67), the first service identifier (address resolution program 306, col 5, ln 59-67).

**As to claim 20,** Hall teaches the message prior (first message, col 8, lm 40-67), the second application (first destination client, col 8, ln 40-67).

**As to claim 23**, Hall teaches a control block (object distribution control block (ODCB 320, col 6, ln 31-41/ Fig. 7).

**As to claim 28, 29, 30, 31**.Hall teaches first protocol/ SNADS routers, col 3, ln 2-32/ SNADS network, col 6, ln 1-30), message (MINE message 302, col 5, ln 59-67 to col 6, ln 1-30).

Hall does not teach conveying the message to an intermediate Message Processing Server (MPS). However, Gerety teaches (message server, col 6, ln 5-26, ln 55-67/col 10, ln 15-67).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Gerety to Hall in order to provide a program or functions to ensure that a tool is available to service every request from another tool.

**As to the method of claim 32**, refer to the rejection of claim 2. Further, Hall does not teach the MSP. However, Gerety teaches (message server, col 6, ln 5-26, ln 55-67/col 10, ln 15-67).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Gerety to Hall in order to provide a program or functions to ensure that a tool is available to service every request from another tool.

**As to the method of claim 33**, refer to the rejection of claim 1. Further, Hall does not teach the MSP. However, Gerety teaches (message server, col 6, ln 5-26, ln 55-67/col 10, ln 15-67).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Gerety to Hall in order to provide a program or functions to ensure that a tool is available to service every request from another tool.

**As to claim 34**, Hall teaches reformatting message (de-encapsulating said encapsulate message, col 9, ln 13-24).

**As to claim 36**, Hall teaches the first application/the second application/ a third application (local or remote, col 3, ln 40-67/ a first destination client, col 8, ln 35-60/ system, col 7, ln 1-29 / client 300, col 5, ln 59-67),), the message (message 316, col 7, ln 1-29), a transport infrastructure (first protocol/ SNADS routers, col 3, ln 2-32/ SNADS network, cl 6, ln 1-30).

Hall does not teach the MSP. However, Gerety teaches message server (col 6, ln 5-26, ln 55-67/col 10, ln 15-67).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Gerety to Hall in order to provide a program or functions to ensure that a tool is available to service every request from another tool.

**As to the method of claim 37**, see the rejection of claim 1.

**As to the method of claim 38**, see the rejection of claim 2.

**As to claim 39**, Hall teaches the routing of the message is determined based on the content of the message (an address resolution procedure, recognizing this message ... is local or remote, col 3, ln 40-80).

**As to the method claim 40**, see the rejection of claim 1,2.

**As to the system of claim 41**, see the rejection of claim 1. Further, Hall does not teach the sending module, the first application is ignorant of the content of the first set of parameters. However, Gerety teach message server (col 6, ln 5-26, ln 55-67/col 10, ln 15-67), a software tool is not in operation for servicing (col 15, ln 40-45).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Gerety to Hall in order to provide a program or functions to ensure that a tool is available to service every request from another tool.

**As to claim 42**, refer to the rejection of claim 2. Further, Hall does not teach the sending module. However, Gerety teach message server ( col 6, ln 5-26, ln 55-67/col 10, ln 15-67),

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Gerety to Hall in order to provide a program or functions to ensure that a tool is available to service every request from another tool.

**As to the system of claim 44**, see the rejection of claim 4.

**As to claim 45**, Hall teaches set of parameter( a tunneling attribute, col 3, ln 40-47), the first directory( a directory, col 3, ln 40-47).

**As to claim 46**, Hall does not teach default parameters. However, Gerety teaches default … relating to each software tool in the system (col 11, ln 30-38).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Gerety to Hall in order to provide a program or functions to ensure that a tool is available to service every request from another tool.

**As to the system of claim 59**, see the rejection of claim 17.

**As to claim 60,** Hall does not teach the archive module that archives the message. However, Gerety teaches (messages sent to the message server. The message server selectively forwards each message (col 6, ln 5-14).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Gerety to Hall in order to provide a program or functions to ensure that a tool is available to service every request from another tool.

**As to the system of claim 63,** see the rejection of claim 23.

**As to the system of claim 68,** see the rejection of claim 28.

**As to the system of claim 69,** see the rejection of claim 29.

**As to the system of claim 70,** see the rejection of claim 30.

**As to the system of claim 71,** see the rejection of claim 31.

**As to the system of claim 72,** refer to the rejection of claim 41. Further, Hall does not teach a receiving module (execution manager, col 11, ln 11-67).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Gerety to Hall in order to provide a program or functions to ensure that a tool is available to service every request from another tool.

**As to the system of claim 73,** see the rejection of claim 39.

**As to the system of claim 74,** refer to the rejection of claim 34. Further, Hall does not teach reformatting engine contained in the MPS. However, Gerety teach the message server asts as a filtering (col 11, ln 1-9).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Gerety to Hall in order to provide a program or functions to ensure that a tool is available to service every request from another tool.

**As to the system of claim 75,** see the rejection of claim 35.

**As to the system of claim 76,** see the rejection of claim 41, 42.

2. Claims **3, 43** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall et al (US. Patent 5,826,023) in view of Gerety et al ( US. Paternt 5,212, 792) and further in view of IBM (Shared directory).

**As to claim 3**, Hall does not teach the first directory is the second directory. However, IBM teaches directory 1 is used for various data processing system operations (page 1).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of IBM to Hall in order to make the application independent messaging system more consistent.

**As to the system of claim 43**, see the rejection of claim 3.

3. Claims **5-16, 18, 35, 47-52, 54-58** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall et al (US. Patent 5,826,023) in view of Gerety et al ( US. Paternt 5,212, 792) and further in view of Garcia et al (US. Patent 6,470,357 B1).

**As to claim 5**, Hall teaches the first directory (directory 304, fig. 5).

Hall does not teach updating the first directory. However, update an EDS database 123, col 5, ln 20-67).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Garcia to Hall in order to retrieve information from directory services such that the application does not need to track and monitor the information about the requested application.

**As to claim 6,** Hall does not explicit teach the term a updating of the first directory is in response to a change with respect to the second application do not necessitate any modification the first application/ a updating of the first directory is in response to a change with respect to the second application do not necessitate any modification the first application. However, Garcia teaches the EDS API 420 writes the update entry into the ESD database 302 and automatically into the EDS database 304,...the EDS API 410 loads a new copy of the EDS database 304 into the local directory service 421(col 7, ln 1-35, Fig. 4).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Garcia to Gerety in order to provide enhanced directory Service to retrieve message routing information, including CMIP routing information from a database or a directory file without maintaining routing and characteristic information for each target application.

**As to claim7,8, 9,10, 11, 12, 13,14, 15,16,** Hall does not teach the a change in location, a change in platform, a change in default setting, a change in the desired operation of the transport infrastructure, a change with respect to the transport infrastructure , a change in priority of message, change in a physical configuration, a interface, a software component, message routing. However, Garcia teaches change in application entity tiles, the location of TMN application in network, parameters. ...(Col 4, ln 1-15).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Garcia to Hall in order to provide enhanced directory Service to retrieve message routing information, including CMIP routing information from a database or a directory file without maintaining routing and characteristic information for each target application.

**As to claim 18**, Hall does not explicit teach term the first service identifier to perform a loop-up. However Garcia teaches the message server traverses the pattern tree only one to identify all tolls, which have requested the received message (col 9, ln 1-61).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Garcia to Gerety in order to provide enhanced directory Service to retrieve message routing information, including CMIP routing information from a database or a directory file without maintaining routing and characteristic information for each target application.

**As to the method of claim 35**, see the rejection of claim 8.

**As to the system of claim 47**, see the rejection of claim 5.

**As to the system of claim 48**, see the rejection of claim 5.

**As to the system of claim 49,50,** see the rejection of claim 7,8.

**As to the system of claim 51, 52** see the rejection of claim 9, 10.

**As to the system of claim 54**, see the rejection of claim 6.

**As to the system of claim 55, 56,57,** see the rejection of claim 13,14,15.

**As to the system of claim 58,** see the rejection of claim 16.

4. Claims **21, 22, 61, 62** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall et al (US. Patent 5,826,023) in view of Gerety et al ( US. Paternt 5,212, 792) and further in view of Hirachi (Track circuit system used in train detector an train operation control system-has controller that detects location of train based on input signal of transceivers arranged on every area unit of track.

**As to claim 21,22**, Hall does not teach tracing a message, reconciling message. However, Hirachi teaches message can be adjusted, track circuit(page 2).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Hirachi to Hall in order to control system-detecting location of message.

**As to the system of claim 61**, see the rejection of claim 21.

**As to the system of claim 62**, see the rejection of claim 22.

5. Claims **24, 25, 64, 65** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall et al (US. Patent 5,826,023) in view of Gerety et al ( US. Paternt 5,212, 792) and further in view of OTA Michihiko(Message communication system).

**As to claims 24, 25**. Hall does not explicit teach control block, a flag, a logical unit of Work, a persistence setting. However, Michihiko teaches control block TCB3, a buffer, flag, flag 1-1 kept turned on (Page 1).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of IBM to Hall in order to make the application independent messaging system more consistent.

**As to the system of claim 64**, see the rejection of claim 24.

**As to the system of claim 65,** see the rejection of claim 25.

6. Claims **26, 53, 66** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall et al (US. Patent 5,826,023) in view of Gerety et al ( US. Paternt 5,212, 792) and further in view of Fukarsu Sadao et al (communication system between processes).

**As to claim 26,** Hall does not teach a priority of message indication being contained in the control block. However, Sadao teaches a packet entry of control block has priority for transferring a process. (Page 1).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of IBM to Hall in order to make the application independent messaging system more consistent.

**As to the system of claim 53**, see the rejection of claim 26.

**As to the system of claim 66**, see the rejection of claim 26.

7. Claims **27, 67** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall et al (US. Patent 5,826,023) in view of Gerety et al ( US. Paternt 5,212, 792) and further in view of Toshiba (Information processor e.g. personal computer (PC) - has message display unit which displays message stored in help table corresponding to indicated button, when event process unit detects that there is indication to button selected to override).

**As to claim 27**, Hall does not teach override parameter. However, Toshiba teaches the message about the reason for selection to override (page 1).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of IBM to Hall in order to make the application independent messaging system more consistent.

**As to the system of claim 67**, see the rejection of claim 27.

*8.* ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LeChi Truong whose telephone number is (703) 305 5312. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 - 5.

Fax phone: AFTER_FINAL faxes must be signed and sent to: (703) 746-2738, OFFICAL faxes must be signed and send to: (703) 746-7239, NON OFFICIAL faxes should not be signed, please send to: (703) 746-7240

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 305 9000.

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100